



---

## 2011 Decisions

## Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit

7-27-2011

# Robert Barefoot v. Stephen Holt

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2011](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2011)

---

### Recommended Citation

"Robert Barefoot v. Stephen Holt" (2011). *2011 Decisions*. 782.  
[https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2011/782](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2011/782)

This decision is brought to you for free and open access by the Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2011 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository.

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

---

No. 10-1806

---

ROBERT R. BAREFOOT;  
DEONNA ENTERPRISES, INC.,  
Appellants

v.

WELLNESS PUBLISHING; HOLT M.D. CONSULTING, INC.;  
NATURES BENEFIT, INC.; STEPHEN HOLT,

---

On Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of New Jersey  
(Civ. No. 3-06-cv-02942)  
District Judge: Hon. Joel A. Pisano

Submitted pursuant to Third Circuit LAR 34.1(a)  
Tuesday, May 24, 2011

Before: McKEE, *Chief Judge*, SCIRICA and RENDELL, *Circuit Judges*

(Opinion filed: July 27, 2011 )

---

OPINION

---

McKEE, *Chief Judge*.

Robert Barefoot and Deonna Enterprises, Inc. appeal the district court's grant of partial summary judgment to Wellness Publishing, Holt M.D. Consulting, Inc., Nature's Benefit, Inc., and Stephen Holt. For the reasons set forth below, we will affirm.

Because we write primarily for the parties, we need not repeat the facts or procedural history of this case. Moreover, the district court has ably summarized the relevant background. *See Barefoot v. Wellness Publ'g*, 2009 WL 4143110 (D.N.J. Nov. 17, 2009). On appeal, Appellants argue that the district court erred when it granted summary judgment to Stephen Holt and dismissed all claims against him.

In his detailed and thoughtful opinion, Judge Pisano carefully and clearly explained his reasons for dismissing Holt from the lawsuit. *See id.* He reiterated these reasons in his opinion and order denying Appellants' motion for reconsideration. *See Barefoot v. Wellness Publ'g*, 2010 WL 893571 (D.N.J. Mar. 8, 2010). We can add little to Judge Pisano's analysis and discussion and we will therefore affirm the district court's order for substantially the same reasons as set forth in that opinion.